

REMARKS

The rejection of claims 1,2, 4-6, 8, 10-17, 19-21, 23, and 25-38 under 35 USC 103(a)

These claims were rejected over as being unpatentable over Gutman et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0101831 A1) in view of Lesesky et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0233284 A1) and in further view of Modzelesky et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0012775 A1). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as applied to the present claims, as follows.

The amended claims are directed to a mobile communications infrastructure platform that, *inter alia*, includes a stand-alone private cellular network. In other words, the mobile platform includes the capability of establishing its own cell network without relying on other terrestrial-based systems, enabling it to overcome the telecom gridlock of situations such as the Sept. 11 (9/11) cell phone network systems crash.

The Modzelesky reference (and the other cited art) does not teach this component or system. The FES-TE of Modzelesky relies on terrestrial cell networks to interface with its other systems, including satcom. This is evident from its teaching at paras. 0154-0160 where it describes "MET Roaming", which involves connecting either to a primary established outside cell phone network or a secondary established cell phone network. Modzelesky does not teach establishing its own, substitute cell phone network autonomous from other networks having the capabilities of the invention and that is self-reliant or "stand-alone" in the sense of not having to rely on the existing networks for providing the cellular telephone service component.

In contrast, the stand-alone aspect of the private cellular network of the invention means that its cellular connections are private and independent from local services, while also including an automatic patching capability to those phone services (specification at p. 3, lines 29-30). The internet/cell telephone module accordingly includes the capability of integrating a complete wireless cellular base station, supporting a variety of communications protocols. Furthermore, whereas cellular base stations typically draw dial tone from physical connections from the public switched

telephone network (PSTN). the invention also includes the capability of creating a dial tone remotely (that is, without reliance on a user's cell phone and its service provider) to allow the cellular base station to function seamlessly as a "private" cellular provider exclusively for users of the system. This is an advantage over the cited art that merely utilizes the other networks that, as observed, rely on user cell phones to create usable dial tone on the remote end. The integration capability of including a complete cellular base station therefore endows the invention with the capability to substitute as the cellular service provider at an incident site (specification at p. 6, line 32- p. 7, line 7). It also provides a wireless module capability by way of an interface providing a "private node" feature. This private node allows the invention to provide service to only authorized individuals at an incident site. These "authorized individuals" can be programmed on the fly using their existing cell equipment or be provided a secure handset from the Infralynx equipment. Once the cellular capability has been established, the user can place calls to other users on the private cellular system. The system automatically detects the number that has been dialed and directs it to the appropriate handset. The baseline system supports 64 handsets but can easily be expanded to support additional users. The utility of this cell system is greatly expanded by terminating the cellular switch into the dial tone that is created by the invention (spec., p. 7. lines 12-21). Nowhere does the prior art provide these further capabilities as extensions of the stand-alone capability unique to the invention. The unique stand-alone design accordingly provides additional capabilities in the invention not taught in the prior art.

Applicants therefore submit that the claims are allowable over the cited art and respectfully request that the rejection as to the present claims now be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 3 and 18 under 35 USC 103(a)

These claims were rejected over as being unpatentable over Gutman et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0101831 A1) in view of Lesesky et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0233284 A1) and in further view of Modzelesky et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0012775 A1) and in further view of Karabinis (US Patent Application

Publication No. 2002/0098802 A1. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, based on the above arguments and for the additional limitations recited therein.

Applicants therefore submit that the claims are allowable over the cited art and respectfully request that the rejection as to the present claims now be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 7 and 22 under 35 USC 103(a)

These claims were rejected over as being unpatentable over Gutman et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0101831 A1) in view of Lesesky et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0233284 A1) and in further view of Modzelesky et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0012775 A1) and in further view of Liu et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0043785 A1). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, based on the above arguments and for the additional limitations recited therein.

Applicants therefore submit that the claims are allowable over the cited art and respectfully request that the rejection as to the present claims now be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 9 and 24 under 35 USC 103(a)

These claims were rejected over as being unpatentable over Gutman et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0101831 A1) in view of Lesesky et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0233284 A1) and in further view of Modzelesky et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0012775 A1) and in further view of Veschi et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002(*sic* 2003)/0161453 A1). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, based on the above arguments and for the additional limitations recited therein.

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the application proceed to allowance without delay.

Application No. 10/691,643
Amendment dated
Reply to Office Action of February 9, 2007

Docket No.: 84339-US2

Dated: May 29, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

L. George Legg

Registration No.: 34,208

US NAVAL RESEARCH LABORATORY

4555 Overlook Ave, SW

Washington, DC 20375

(202) 404-1559

(202) 404-7380 (Fax)

Attorney For Applicant